

REMARKS

The above amendments and following remarks are responsive to the points raised in the December 28, 2005 final Office Action. Upon entry of the above amendments, Claims 1 and 4 will have been amended, Claims 2, 3, and 5-15 will have been canceled, and Claims 1 and 4 will be pending. No new matter has been introduced. No issues have been raised that require further consideration or search. Entry and reconsideration are respectfully requested.

Response to Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(b) and 103(a)

Claims 1, 3, 5-8, and 12-14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being unpatentable over US Patent 6,047,042 to Khutoryansky et al. (Khutoryansky). Claims 2, and 9-11 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Khutoryansky, as applied to Claim 1, and further in view of JP 06-251893 to Kobayashi et al. (Kobayashi). Claim 4 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Khutoryansky, as applied to Claim 3, and further in view of JP 2000-023959 to Katayama. Claim 15 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Khutoryansky in view of US Patent 6,459,755 to Li (Li). Applicants traverse these rejections.

Independent Claim 1 has been amended to recite a radiographic apparatus including, inter alia:

“a plurality of radiation dose detectors arranged in the flat panel detector to detect a dose of radiation from the object”.

Applicants respectfully submit that none of the cited references of Khutoryansky, Kobayashi, Katayama, and/or Li, teach, suggest, or otherwise render obvious, the subject matter recited in independent Claim 1. More specifically, none of the cited references of Khutoryansky,

Amendment and Request for Reconsideration (37 CFR § 1.116)

Kobayashi, Katayama, and/or Li, teach, suggest, or otherwise render obvious, radiation dose detectors arranged in a flat panel detector. The primary reference of Khutoryansky merely discloses the sensor arrays 110 and 122 located in a position apart from the planar electronic detector 118. As such, the subject matter recited by amended Claim 1, as well as dependent Claim 4, is distinguished over the disclosure of Khutoryansky.

The secondary references of Kobayashi, Katayama, and/or Li likewise fail to teach or suggest radiation dose detectors arranged in a flat panel detector. On this basis, Applicants respectfully submit that none of the applied references of Khutoryansky, Kobayashi, Katayama, and/or Li, either alone or in combination, include any teaching, suggestion, or motivation that would teach, suggest, or otherwise motivate one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to modify the disclosure of Khutoryansky in view of Kobayashi, Katayama, and/or Li, as advanced by the Examiner. As such, the subject matter of amended independent Claim 1, as well as dependent Claim 4, is distinguished over the references of Khutoryansky, Kobayashi, Katayama, and/or Li, either alone or in combination.

Accordingly, the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(b) and 103(a) should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1 and 4 are in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

AUTHORIZATION

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees which may be required for filing this Amendment and Request for Reconsideration to Deposit Account No. 13-4500, Order No. 1232-5259.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.

Dated: March 28, 2006

By: 

Brian W. Brown

Registration No. 47,265

(202) 857-7887 Telephone

(202) 857-7929 Facsimile

Correspondence Address:
MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.
Three World Financial Center
New York, NY 10281-2101
(212) 415-8700 Telephone
(212) 415-8701 Facsimile